Language in culture and society
a reader in linguistics and anthropology

[edited by] Dell Hymes.

LANGUAGE IN CULTURE AND SOCIETY

A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology

15

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 64-15151

Contents

Part II. Equality, Diversity, Relativity

Part III. World View and Grammatical Categories

Part IV. Cultural Focus and Semantic Field

Part V. Role, Socialization, and Expressive Speech

Part VI. Speech Play and Verbal Art

Part VII. Social Structure and Speech Community

Part VIII. Processes and Problems of Change

Acknowledgments

1. Reprinted from Franz Boas, Introduction, in Franz Boas (Ed.), *Handbook of American Indian Languages* (BAE-B 40, Part I), (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1911), pp. 59–73. By courtesy of the Bureau of American Ethnology.
2. Reprinted from *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 1948, *4*:140–147. By permission of the author and the editor.
3. Reprinted from Paul L. Garvin (Ed.), *Report of the Seventh Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Study* (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, No. 9), (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, 1957), pp. 167–173. By permission of the author and the Institute of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University.
4. Translated by D. H. Hymes from Claude Levi-Strauss, *Anthropologie structurale* (Paris: Plon, 1958), chap. 2. By permission of the author and the publishers. An earlier version was published in French as L'Analyse structurale en linguistique et anthropologie, in *Word*, 1945, *1*:1–21.
5. Reprinted from *Estudios antropólogicos publicados en homenaje al doctor Manuel Gamio* (Mexico, D.F.: Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología, 1956), pp. 659-671. By permission of the author and the Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología.
6. Reprinted from *Nature*, 1937, *140*:172–173. By permission of the editor. The review appeared under the title retained here.
7. Extracted from J. R. Firth, The Technique of Semantics, *Transactions of the Philological Society* (London: 1935), pp. 36–72. The article has also been reprinted in J. R. Firth, *Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957), pp. 7–35. By permission of the Philological Society and Miss Jean M. Wheeler.
8. Extracted from T. G. H. Strehlow, *Aranda Traditions* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1947), pp. xvi-xxi. By permission of the author and the publisher.
9. Reprinted in abridged form from *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1952, *18*:172–177. By permission of the author and the editor.
10. Reprinted from *Word*, 1945, *1*:194–208. By permission of the author and the editors.

11. Reprinted from *Word*, 1946, *2*:103–112. By permission of Mrs. Jean Sapir, Morris Swadesh, and the editors.
12. Extracted from Franz Boas, Introduction, in Franz Boas (Ed.), *Handbook of American Indian Languages* (BAE-B 40, Part I), (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1911), pp. 24–27, 42–43, 81.
13. Translated by D. H. Hymes from A. Meillet, Le Genre féminin dans les langues Indo-européenes, *Journal de psychologie: normale et pathologique*, 1923, *20*:943–944. By the permission of the editor.
14. Translated by D. H. Hymes from Marcel Mauss, Discussion, *Journal de psychologie: normale et pathologique*, 1923, *20*:944–947. By the permission of the editors. This discussion and the preceding article are reprinted in A. Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale* (Collection Linguistique, Societé de Linguistique de Paris, No. 60), (Paris: Klincksieck, 1952 [new printing], pp. 24–28.
15. Reprinted from *Science*, 1931, *74*:578. By permission of *Science* and Mrs. Jean Sapir.
16. Reprinted in abridged form from John B. Carroll (Ed.), *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf* (New York: Wiley; Cambridge: Technology Press, 1956), pp. 65–86. By permission of the editor and the publishers.
17. Reprinted from *Language*, 1951, *27*:111–120. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.
18. Reprinted from *American Anthropologist*, 1962, *64*:340–350. By permission of the author and the American Anthropological Association.
19. Extracted in modified form from Franz Boas, *Geographical Names of the Kwakiutl Indians* (Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology, No. 20), (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), pp. 9–21. By permission of the publishers.
20. Reprinted with slight revisions by the author from *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1955, *21*:187–189. By permission of the author and the editor.
21. Reprinted with slight revisions by the author from Ward H. Goodenough, *Property, Kin, and Community on Truk* (Yale University Publications in Anthropology, No. 46), (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951), pp. 61–64. By permission of the author, the Yale University Press, and the Department of Anthropology, Yale University.
22. Reprinted from *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 1955, *11*:339–344. By permission of the author and the editor.
23. Reprinted from *American Anthropologist*, 1961, *63*:113–132. By permission of the author and the American Anthropological Association.
24. Reprinted from *The Uganda Journal*, 1948, *12*:166–171. By permission of the author and The Uganda Society.
25. Reprinted from *Language*, 1944, *20*:142–149. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.
26. Reprinted from *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1961, *62*:375–

385. By permission of the authors and the American Psychological Association.
27. Reprinted from *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1948, *14*:11–14. By permission of the author and the editor.
28. Reprinted with an additional postscript by the author, from *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 1961, *1*:313–324. By permission of the author and Pergamon Press Ltd.
29. Reprinted from *Man*, 1954, *54*:55–57. By permission of the editor and The Royal Anthropological Institute.
30. Reprinted from *Word*, 1949, *5*:268–272. By permission of the author and the editors.
31. Extracted from John Boman Adams, Culture and Conflict in an Egyptian Village. *American Anthropologist*, 1957, *59*:225–235. By permission of the author and the American Anthropological Association.
32. Reprinted from *Studies in Linguistics*, 1958, *13*:1–12. By permission of the author.
33. Reprinted from *Language*, 1959, *35*:631–636. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.
34. Reprinted from *Journal of American Folklore*, 1957, *70*:173–175. By permission of the author and the American Folklore Society.
35. Reprinted from *Language*, 1948, *24*:280–286. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.
36. Reprinted from *Word*, 1945, *1*:217–238. By permission of the author and the editors.
37. Reprinted from *Journal of American Folklore*, 1958, *71*:312–324. By permission of the author and the American Folklore Society.
38. Reprinted in abridged form from *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*, 1947, *37*:329–352. By permission of the author and the editor.
39. Reprinted in abridged form from Thomas A. Sebeok, Structure and Content of Cheremis Charms, Part One, *Anthropos*, 1953, *48*:369–388. By permission of the author and the Anthropos Institut; and from Thomas A. Sebeok, The Texture of a Cheremis Incantation, *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, 1962, *125*:523–527 (Helsinki, 1962), by permission of the author and the Finno-Ugric Society.
40. Extracted from Ann H. Gayton and Stanley S. Newman, *Yokuts and Western Mono Myths* (UCP-AR, *5*:1), (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1940), pp. 4–11. By permission of the authors and the University of California Press.
41. Reprinted from *American Speech*, 1927, *2*:432–439. By permission of Columbia University Press.
42. Reprinted from *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 1955, *11*:345–354. By permission of the author and the editor.
43. This article was the basis of a talk presented before the Association for Asian Studies in New York City on April 1, 1958. It has never before been published.

44. Reprinted from *American Anthropologist*, 1961, *63*:976–988. By permission of the author and the American Anthropological Association.
45. Reprinted from *Word*, 1959, *15*:325–340. By permission of the author and the editors.
46. Reprinted with slight revisions by the author from *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1959, *1*(3):34–41. By permission of the author and the editor.
47. Reprinted from *Language*, 1948, *24*:335–345. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.
48. Reprinted with slight revisions by the author from *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1939, *9*:117–118. By permission of the author and the editor.
49. Reprinted with slight revision by the author from *Current Anthropology*, 1960, *1*(5–6):424–425. By permission of the author and the editor.
50. Reprinted with revisions by the author from *American Speech*, 1948, *23*:194–203. By permission of the author and Columbia University Press.
51. Reprinted from *Word*, 1958, *14*:47–56. By permission of the author and the editor.
52. Reprinted from *American Anthropologist*, 1957, *53*:338–341. By permission of the author and the American Anthropological Association.
53. Reprinted from *Language*, 1961, *37*:97–112. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.
54. Reprinted from *Language*, 1956, *32*:146–157. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.
55. Reprinted from *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1959, *1*(2):28–31. By permission of the author and the editor.
56. Reprinted from *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1955, *21*:228–294. By permission of the author and the editor.
57. Reprinted from *Social Forces*, 1938, *17*:107–118. By permission of the author and the Williams and Wilkins Company.
58. Reprinted from *African Studies*, 1953, *12*:1–9. By permission of the author and the Editorial Committee.
59. Reprinted from *Language*, 1950, *26*:175–185. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.
60. Reprinted in slightly modified form from *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 1959, *15*:20–35. By permission of the author and the editor.
61. This article was written especially for this volume and has never before been published.
62. Reprinted with slight revisions from *Language*, 1948, *24*:117–131. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.
63. Reprinted in abridged form from *Word*, 1956, *12*:175–210. By permission of the author and the editors.
64. Reprinted in slightly revised form from *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 1951, *7*:1–21. By permission of the author and the editor.
65. Reprinted from *Word*, 1945, *1*:54–58. By permission of the author and the editors.

66. Reprinted from *Language*, 1956, *32*:3–16. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.
67. Extracted from A. L. Kroeber, Statistics, Indo-European, and Taxonomy, *Language*, 1960, *36*:1–21. By permission of Mrs. Theodora Kroeber and the Linguistic Society of America.
68. This article was written especially for this volume and has never before been published.
69. Reprinted with slight corrections and omission of the first and last sections from *Language*, 1961, *37*:1–28. By permission of the author and the Linguistic Society of America.

Foreword

AS AN ANTHROPOLOGIST who found his way into his profession by being shown how to analyze Boas' *Chinook Texts* into grammar, and whose first remembered purely intellectual pleasure, as a boy of ten, was the demonstration of pattern in the classes of English strong verbs, it is a pleasure to say something about Professor Hymes' reader.

It is a recognized problem whether we ought to say "language *and* culture" or "language *in* culture." As to the essential relevant facts, everyone is in agreement. When we need a term for that larger whole which is the common property of all groups of men and which distinctively sets off mankind from all other animals, there is no question: we call it culture. Even where special contexts favor or justify special terms, like "civiliazation" or "noesis" (derived from Sir Julian Huxley's "noetic evolution"), it is clearly culture that is meant. But an equally important consideration is that language is easily the most nearly autonomous, self-consistent, and self-contained unit which is discernible within the totality of culture. Why this is—why perhaps it had to be so—is something that we do not understand with clarity or conviction; and I shall therefore not try even to suggest an explanation, but accept the fact as something that students of language and students of culture both posit as a starting point, explicitly or implicitly.

It is, however, a fair question what language-study and culture-study share, if one is a part of the other. They share certain processes and properties and allegiances which the articles in this book touch on, avowedly or by reference, again and again, and which its reader will know something about when he has finished the perusal. There is however, one kind of content, one body of phenomena, which language and culture indubitably share—and that is meaning.

It is one of the tenets of modern linguistic science that as it has cast out psychologizing as something irrelevant, distracting, and likely to be misleading *to the linguist*, so also it must try to operate as far as possible without leaning unduly on meaning. Of course, every linguist knows that this is impossible. The fourth chapter of this very book is directed toward semantics. And yet the ideal is clear; a good descriptive grammar deals with strictly linguistic units, such as phonemes and morphemes, their forms and their distributions (these last being their place, order, combination, or any other

mathematically expressible occurrence). Alas for the ideal! There regularly are less morphemes than different patterned distributions occurring in any language. And how do we keep them apart? By their meaning. And legitimately so; for the meanings are also facts adhering to the facts of morphemes and morpheme distributions. And that they can be relevant is obvious from the circumstance that whatever else language does, one of its patent uses is to convey information.

In short, the apparent antisemantic attitude of recent modern linguistics is the result of having developed an operational and pragmatic procedure that gives clean-cut immediate recognition of the elements, patterns, and structure of languages. No linguists deny meaning nor do they deny that ultimately the relation of linguistic structure and meaning is a problem which will have to be admitted and attacked. It is just that pure linguistic science is so much more developed and better organized than semantic science that linguists find they can travel faster and farthest with a minimum encumbrance of the semantic baggage.

Where anthropology is concerned in this is that anthropology is the particular science which is most immediately and wholeheartedly—holistically is the technical word for it—concerned with culture as such, culture in general, and in particular, but it is always more than some special aspect or part of culture such as economic culture or social culture or technological or religious or intellectual culture. Anthropology is therefore less ready than linguistic science to accept the astringent technique of purging out meaning as far as possible. Not that anthropologists are aficionados with special semantic interest; on the whole they are probably pretty innocent of that. But the meanings of words do attach to those very artifacts and mentifacts which constitute culture and which attach also to that nature in the frame of which every culture must be set. Linguists have an informal and nonprofessional way of saying that lexicon *is* merely culture. This is roughly quite true: a dictionary does exemplify or embody only a small part of the structure of its language; and nearly all of its content—all except the relatively small number of "grammatical words"—is of cultural relevance.

I want to say one more thing about "meaning": a caution. Anthropologists sometimes say that in all cultural phenomena there can be distinguished form (or sensory appearance), use, function, and meaning. This meaning is something quite different from linguistic meaning; it signifies more nearly the subjective emotional connotation of a phenomenon rather than its semantic denotation. For good measure and distraction I add the query whether the third member of this tetralogy, function, is ever anything else than either a purpose or a relation which the members of the culture are unaware of, but which the anthropologist is clever enough to discern.

Anthropological study, if sufficiently intensive, must include some linguistic forms and their range of meaning: all those forms, for one thing, whose range of meaning differs from that of the most nearly corresponding terms in our own speech—like *mana* or *taboo* or *totem*, for instance; or again like the

Japanese words which we half-translate and therefore mistranslate by *sincerity* or *obligation* or *reciprocation* or *thanks*. Or, even simpler, when a native word means not *blue* or *green*, but *blue or green*, or *ako* does not mean *brother* but *older brother, exclusive of younger, but inclusive of parallel cousin*.

However, the common roots of the study of language and culture go much deeper than such mere clarifications and safeguards. They are evidenced by men like Boas and Sapir being eminent in both anthropology and linguistics; and thus among Sapir's students, represented by passages in this book, there were some who took anthropological degrees and now hold linguistic positions as well as linguists now in anthropology departments. One might add that all major institutions of learning in the United States regularly include a linguist in their anthropological staffs.

It is also well to remember that as a matter of history our western civilization linguistic science grew out of philology, which was concerned with meanings and norms, and with texts and literature, and with culture in both the humanist's and the scientist's sense of the word culture. It was by clotting itself out from this little-differentiated continuum that pure or general linguistics originated; and the "revolt against meaning" is but one stage in the process. Yet the underlying relations of linguistics with humanism and philology remain; and when sufficient differentiation has been accomplished, we may anticipate a new reintegration, which will leave all participants more broadly based and more effectively equipped. One of the taproots of anthropology is humanistic, just as one of the currents that nourished linguistics is, in the strictest sense, scientific. This book should help keep alive past intellectual endeavors in their living present forms, as well as advance the day of future larger reconstitution.

A. L. KROEBER

General Introduction

WITH *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*, I have tried to provide a book that will serve the needs of students and teachers, and also interest anyone concerned with the serious study of the topics named in the title.

Most obviously, of course, the book should be useful for courses in "Language and Culture"—that multifariously defined label under which topics associated with language are often introduced into the curriculum. Indeed, the book emerges mainly from my own experiences in teaching and research under that heading. As part of professional training at the graduate level, it provides the only single volume coverage of the field from an anthropological point of view. At the same time, I hope that it is a volume that can be put in the hands of students and colleagues, apart from courses, as a general guide to anthropological concerns with language. The contents have been made as ample as possible, and extensive bibliographies prepared, with that twin purpose in mind.

The perspective that informs the book can be summarized in a few paragraphs, directed at the reasons for including such material, and such a book, in the training of anthropologists. (Although I shall usually speak simply of "language," on the one hand, and "culture," on the other, the terms should be understood as implying, respectively, "and speech," and "and society," as well.)

Whatever one's views of the nature and goals of anthropology, clearly speech is so fundamental an activity of man, language so integral a part of his culture, that no teaching of anthropology worthy of the name could pass either by. Not only would our subject be incomplete without them, but speech and language provide useful, sometimes crucial, examples of general problems, whether we focus on how men differ, or how they are alike; on how cultures work, or how they change; on the scope of anthropology, or the skills of the anthropologist.

The area to which conversance with language and linguistics does not pertain seems small. Only the few whose work does not involve field ethnography, historical anthropology, or general theory, can safely ignore them. Such a general principle, however, is hard to separate from its most salient examples. Not only, as Levi-Strauss (1953) pointed out, must one distinguish the rela-

tionships between language and culture from those between *a* language and *a* culture, and between linguistics and anthropology; one must also distinguish the relations which may obtain between particular linguists (or departments of linguistics) and particular anthropologists, sociologists, literary scholars, etc.(or departments of same). The pertinence of linguistics will be judged by many anthropologists in terms of their experience with particular scholars and departments; and it is in these terms that they will judge the kind and amount of linguistic knowledge and training their anthropology students need. Thus the present book is intended as something of an argument and ostensive definition, designed to have a scope broader than may be manifest in particular programs of linguistic training, in or out of anthropology, in relation to anthropological concerns. The purpose is to show that there exists, apart from the particularities of given institutions, a broad, complex, and significant field of linguistic problems—one that intersects almost every concern of the anthropologist, as well as of students of related behavioral and humanistic disciplines; and to show that the field has a noteworthy history, a lively present, and a future of promise.

At the same time it must be noted that the book contains little or nothing of certain topics central to linguistics itself. This is partly so because such topics as the methods of formal descriptive linguistics are quite adequately handled at length in other books, and nothing would be gained by handling them tangentially here. The technique and perspective gained by training in such methods is prerequisite to active contribution to most of the anthropological interests represented in the present volume, of course, and just because such methods are not represented as such, I should like to underscore their importance. Partly, however, the exclusion has also a theoretical justification. It is simply that the status of such methods is usually different as between linguistics proper and anthropology. In present-day linguistics the methods and forms of descriptive statement loom large as ends in themselves. In anthropology they must always have the status of means.

This last distinction is but an aspect of the general thesis that the relation between anthropology and linguistics, historically and in present practice, is the same as that between anthropology and a number of other disciplines; there is overlap rather than inclusion of one by the other. On the one hand, the special discipline, such as linguistics, does not exhaust the interest of the anthropologist. While in principle committed to coordinating all scientific knowledge about a subject, it has its particular set of technical skills, its particular history, ideology, emphases, and professional organization, all subject to local variation in time and place. Linguistics as a discipline is, in fact, a congeries of subfields, whose orientations are conditioned by particular bodies of data, national backgrounds, leading figures, and favorite problems (as Malkiel points out and documents in the last section of the book). In consequence, it may very well occur that anthropologists make their own contributions of data and of theory, and their concerns may give rise to questions which the linguistics of their immediate environment may not at the time be asking,

or to emphases which it may not care to make. On the other hand, the anthropological interest in language does not exhaust that of the linguist. On general intellectual principle, of course, nothing linguistic is alien to anthropology, but at any given time and place, anthropology's active interest is far from covering everything within the manifold domain of the scientific study of language. In short, the anthropological interest is always selective, grouping together facets of language that might not otherwise attract joint attention.

All this has a bearing on the training of anthropologists. Depending on the representation of special fields and interests, the teaching of linguistics will vary greatly from one institution to another, and some offerings will be of more relevance to anthropology than others. Moreover, in any case other departments cannot be expected to provide all the linguistic training and orientation toward language that anthropologists need. Departments of anthropology must themselves exercise responsibility for some of the linguistic knowledge their students need.

The general thesis can be put in terms of ideal goals. (1) It is the task of linguistics to coordinate knowledge about language from the viewpoint of language. (2) It is anthropology's task to coordinate knowledge about language from the viewpoint of *man*. Put in terms of history and practice, the thesis is that there is a distinctive field, ***linguistic anthropology***, conditioned, like other subfields of linguistics and anthropology, by certain bodies of data, national background, leading figures, and favorite problems. In one sense, it is a characteristic activity, the activity of those whose questions about language are shaped by anthropology. Its scope is not defined by logic or nature, but by the range of active anthropological interest in linguistic phenomena. Its scope may include problems that fall outside the active concern of linguistics, and ***always it uniquely includes the problem of integration with the rest of anthropology***. In sum, linguistic anthropology can be defined as ***the study of language within the context of anthropology***.

The thesis has a bearing on the training of anthropologists, for when we teach about language in anthropology, to some extent we engage in linguistic anthropology in this sense. We are not teaching linguistics as it would or might be taught by a specialist who knew nothing of anthropology, just as in other cases we are not teaching economics, political science, or history of religions as these might be taught by their specialists. We are teaching as anthropologists concerned with subjects relevant to questions which anthropologists ask. Rather than adding one quantum of discipline A to set beside quanta of disciplines B, C, and, D, we are trying to consider the subject-matter of all those disciplines from some general point of view. This being so, we should approach the subject-matter of a particular field, such as speech and language, with emphasis on the fundamental questions it poses for anthropology, rather than on sheer information content; and we should approach such questions from a general ground held in common with the rest of anthropology, rather than leave them disjunct in terms couched only for specialists. (For example, the concepts of the phoneme, morpheme, and other units of descriptive

linguistics could be approached in terms of the role of cultural factors in perception).

At this point the pedagogic and the scientific goals meet. To be able to teach easily and effectively in the way recommended above would presuppose a good deal of work in empirical organization and theoretical analysis that, in fact, has yet to be done. The present reader is a case in point. Ideally, such a collection would illustrate a well articulated body of theory, or a well defined set of problems having general acceptance. At present a reader in the area of language, culture, and society cannot wholly do so. The resurgent spread of linguistic interests in anthropology and related fields is too recent, and the strands and centers of interest too varied, for such consensus. A sense of the need for such a book has prompted me to go ahead, despite delays and difficulties, making the best choices my own awareness of the state of theory and relevance of problems would permit. The organization of the sections, and the introductions to them, do not pretend to be more than a step. If the book proves useful and stimulating, my hope, as that of Professor Kroeber in his Foreword, is that it may advance the day when a better integrated body of theory and problems exists.

Several of the most significant conceptual approaches that have been proposed so far are represented in Part I (cf. also Hockett's article in Part IX). Such treatments tend to assume the existence of two distinct disciplines, and/or subject matters, and to proceed to explore their interdependence, not only substantively, but also in part methodologically, as seen from the author's point of view. Here and in the rest of the book, the organization brings out the main foci of anthropological concern with language, not so much in terms of the filling in of a preconceived scheme as through an inductive reflection of existing types of work. The themes of the remaining parts can be summarized as follows: (II) the evaluation of differences and similarities among languages, especially of exotic languages in relation to our own; (III) the significance of linguistic patterns for the basic outlook of a people; (IV) the relation between a people's vocabulary and their other interests; (V) how speaking enters into norms of interaction among persons, and into the acquisition of such norms by children; (VI) how the motives of play and art are manifested linguistically—the ludic and aesthetic aspects of speech; (VII) the relation between levels or varieties of speech, on the one hand, and types of community and their boundaries, on the other; (VIII) how social factors enter into linguistic change; (IX) modes of classifying and interpreting resemblances among languages, especially as to their historical import; (X) wareness of our own scholarly and scientific activity as one conditioned aspect of the place of language in culture.

Beyond the foci of attention signaled by the sections, the reader should be aware of a number of other themes, and conceptual distinctions, that pervade anthropological concerns with language and are valuable for their interpretation, as pointers, or lines of explication. (For convenience of identification, the themes and distinctions are numbered consecutively.)

First, there are two themes which have to do with the vocation of anthropology, and which can be traced as keys to its history: (1) interpreting the relation of other ways of life (including other ways of speech) to our own, and (2) standing between the natural sciences and the humanities in method and subject matter. The first theme carries with it the danger of succumbing to one or the other of two temptations that dog the interpretive tasks; *failure of empathy*, the "classical" error, too readily assuming a single norm, often our own, by which to judge diversity; and *failure of identity*, the "romantic" reaction to diversity, giving one's heart too wholly or readily to another way of life, substituting its norm (real or imagined) for our own. The problem of maintaining a proper balance carries over into the second theme. Often enough the anthropologist find himself attacked from both sides, as too "humanistic," too "subjective," or impure in method to qualify as a scientist, and as too "mechanistic," too concerned with explicit method and objectifying materials to be acceptable to defenders of the humanities. Yet he is committed to honor the gods of both, the necessity of objectivity and generality on the one hand, of neglecting nothing of human value on the other. (On the perspectives of anthropology, for those unacquainted with them, two excellent succinct treatments are Clyde Kluckhohn, "Common Humanity and Diverse Cultures," in Daniel Lerner (Ed.), *The Human Meaning of the Social Sciences*, pp. 245–284 (New York: Meridian Books), and Alfred Kroeber, "The History of the Personality of Anthropology," AA, 1959, 61:3.398–404.)

Of equal importance are two linguistic themes, (3) the extension of the concept and method of structural analysis as the key to understanding language and language-linked phenomena, both descriptively and historically, and (4) the key role of language in human life, and hence of linguistics in its study. The first implies the distinction between (5) structure and variation, the second that between (6) structure and function. What one understands by the concept and method of structural analysis, and how one phrases the key role of language, of course may vary a good deal. In general, in fact, these distinctions, and those to follow, have their prime importance as guides to understanding differences of emphasis and approach, and what controversy may be about. What one counts as structure, as opposed to variation; as structurally relevant or irrelevant; how and where one expects to find structure; whether one sees certain phenomena as deviations from a structural norm, or sees the structure as inhering in the range of variation; to what extent one conceives structure as inherent in certain data, or as a model, perhaps an a priori one, of the analyst's devising (a contrast made famous in the profession by F. W. Householder, Jr., as "God's truth" vs. "hocus pocus")—questions such as these bring out significant differences in the views scholars take, for example, towards the relation of language and linguistic method to other phenomena of anthropological interest, and affect the work of anthropological interest that gets done. One of the most crucial questions is that of one's criteria for structural relevance and validity, a problem which Kenneth L. Pike has signaled as that of "emic" vs. "etic" classification (see his article in

Part I). A similar question deals with one's conception of the role of language in human life, for such a conception implies some assumption, explicit or not, as to what function or functions of language exist, or are primary, and as to how language enters into the history of the child or the species.

Related to the concept of structural analysis are three similar, but by no means identical, distinctions between (7) language and speech; (8) code and message; (9) habit and behavior. Assumptions about the nature of these distinctions, and what phenomena should be assigned to each, underlie a good deal of current work and controversy. Together they point to the fundamental questions of the locus, and the object, of what one describes and treats as "linguistic." Related also is the question of what linguistic phenomena one treats as (10) product and as process; (11) as historically given or as on-going activity; or, how one treats vis-a-vis each other the distinctions of (12) synchronic vs. diachronic, on the one hand, and (13) static vs. dynamic, on the other. A good deal of unconscious inconsistency and confusion is possible when moving between such distinctions, or between them and one or more of the preceding pairs.

One must keep in mind, of course, the distinctions noted earlier between (14) language and culture, (15) a language and a culture, and (16) linguistics and anthropology, the corresponding terms of which are sometimes unjustifiably merged. It is important also to note how the relations between the terms of one of the preceding three distinctions may be conceived. In particular, is the relation of language to other aspects of culture seen as that of (17) evidence, or instance? Is relationship sought in terms of correlation between the two, or in terms of linguistic phenomena as an index of something else? Or are linguistic phenomena treated as themselves a manifestation of the cultural point in question, whether or not they correlate in some particular way with other aspects? Both approaches may be appropriate in some contexts, and misleading in others.

Here we have often to deal with a deceptive slipping back and forth between two uses of the term "culture," between (18) its use as a theoretical or generic term (in which case its defining characteristics imply the inclusion of language), and its use as a convenient shorthand for aspects of culture, except language. The second use, of course, underlies such expressions as "language and culture." Such a use is paralleled with other aspects of culture, but not all; the exceptions are perhaps ethos and social structure. (Witness the use of "art and culture," "music and culture," "technology and culture," but not, say, "kinship and culture," in recent anthropological writing.) The criterion for the second use seems to be that the field in question involves some sort of study of physical objects (including texts here as objects) that has become associated with technical competence. What makes the slipping back and forth between the two uses of "culture" a rather vicious habit is the fact that the generality and prestige of the first use may be implicitly carried over into the second. Then the implicit parenthesis of "X and (other aspects of) culture" is erased, and the X relegated to a periphery, the burden of proving a relevance

to the central term being its own. (No one asks in so many words about the relation between "kinship and culture," although it must sometimes seem as problematic as that of language.)

The second sense of "culture" is, of course, used in the title of the present book, and the distinction implied is likely to continue to be a useful one, given the ease with which language can be distinguished as a phenomenon; the continuation of a distinct discipline specializing in its study; and the awkwardness of longer phrases such as "language and other aspects of culture and society," as against the economy and familiarity of the formula, "language and X." No practical harm is done, and there are quite appropriate occasions for use of the formula, so long as one remembers that on a theoretical plane the situation is different. Failure to remember can confuse or impair anthropological thinking and research, setting up false antitheses and leaving significant phenomena unstudied.

Part of the problem is that there is a second, and similar familiar usage to cope with, the habit of referring to "word and deed," of saying that "actions speak louder than words," so that it is sometimes necessary for scientists to remind themselves that the use of words is itself an act, speaking itself a form of behavior.

The question of the relation between language and culture often involves a complex of issues that may be summed up under the heading of striking a balance between language as (19) a "help" and a "hindrance"—adopting two terms once used by Sapir (1933a; p. 11 in Mandelbaum (Ed.) (1949)). One may look at language as making thought possible, and one may also look at it as molding and hence restricting thought. One may see language as a powerful and essential means of human communication, and one may also view languages as artificial barriers to international understanding. And so on. Involved here are such issues as (20) the degree of interdependence between language and thought, or the rest of culture, or society, or personality, or behavior, and (21) the relative preponderance of influence in one or the other direction. Also involved is the distinction between (22) the potential of a language as an open system, and its actual capacity as learned and used at a given place and time; and the distinction already made (14, 15, 16) between the generic properties of language and culture, the particular properties of *a* language and *a* culture, and the particular properties of the material studied by certain linguists and anthropologists.

Another complex of issues may be characterized as involving the distribution relative to each other of languages, as named units, and other anthropological units, whether historically ("race, language, culture") or contemporaneously (multilingualism, boundaries of speech communities, etc.). Here often enters the question of (23) part in relation to whole. It is a question of what set of features, or sample, may be accepted as representative, so that one speaks of it, or takes it as identical with, a language on the one hand, and a culture, or society, or personality, on the other. Often enough a finding of lack of relation between language and culture, or between languages, depends upon

the particular conception of one or the other term with which one begins, and may be an artifact of that partiality. Conversely, an equating of two units may be similarly based. Two recurrent examples of the problem are the equation of a "language" with that fraction of its features which, through retention from a common ancestor, give it its genetic classification, and the equation of a "language" with that aspect of linguistic phenomena which may be caught up in a linguist's description. The answer, of course, is to investigate beforehand the validity of the set of features, or sample, as a basis for the purpose in question.

Of general importance is the extent to which (24) uniformity, or difference, is stressed, whether as between languages, between a language and a culture, within a language, or whatever; and also, of course, the way in which uniformity and difference are conceived. Here we have a principal linguistic instance of the anthropological vocation to relate other ways of life to our own. The task can be put as accounting for the uniformities and differences in the natural condition of mankind. So phrased, it underlies not only many theoretical notions and cross-cultural studies, but also classificatory work generally. Changes of relative emphasis upon uniformity and difference, and the ways in which they have been conceived (evolutionary, historical, functional, and so forth) have played a great part in the history of linguistics and anthropology. (The dimension of part in relation to whole is again involved.)

Most important of all, perhaps, in the present connection is the distinction between (25) the interdependence of language and culture (or, a language and a culture, linguistics and anthropology), on the one hand, and their relative autonomy on the other. The emphasis in this book is of course on interdependence, but, as the preceding distinctions, and the contents themselves, make clear, there is a good deal of variation in opinion as to the nature of the interdependence.

These distinctions may be helpful in teaching and thinking about the study of speech and language in an anthropological context. Let me now explain further the plan and origin of the book.

In general the selections have been made with a view to showing the development, and the range, of anthropological concerns with language. (The list of contents, and their juxtapositions, may themselves be informative.) Each section has an introduction to point up these matters. In addition, each selection is followed by a reference note, giving background information from the original footnotes, and the article's own references, if any. The reference notes frequently contain further references, topically arranged, on the subject of the article. As a means of economy, recurrent references are given in full only once in a general bibliography at the end of the book, being identified elsewhere by author and year (e.g., Sapir, 1921). Thus an article, or the introductory comment of a reference note, may contain citations to be found both in the immediately following list and in the general bibliography. Together, the reference notes and general bibliography form something of a working bibliography of the entire field. An alphabetical guide to the topics for which special bibliography is given follows the general bibliography.

As to the contents themselves, each scholar would doubtless make a more or less different choice. My own conception of the book and of individual contents has changed a good deal since the project was first conceived (as a reader in American Indian linguistics), and since work on the broader scale first began at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, while I was a Fellow there in 1957–1958. The present contents reflect the helpful advice of a number of colleagues, who responded to a request for comment on a preliminary list. The final selection and responsibility, of course, remain mine, and there are no doubt biases, conscious and unconscious, that will variously please and displease; I am aware how much the modification of the list over the years since the book's inception reflects not only the advice of others, but also my own intellectual development during the period. In support of the present list, I may say that there has been a positive reason for every inclusion, and that as much has been included as has been practically possible. Moreover, the bibliographies can quickly lead to other literature and points of view. Also, good students find disagreement stimulating. Some of the articles have been included because I have found them useful starting-points for lectures and class discussion. If one of them provokes someone to plunge into the literature, or the field, to prove a point, or sets off a chain of thought that transcends the offending view, the hours of correspondence, editing, and proofreading will have been justified.

Several specific considerations affecting the selection should be explained. I have mostly avoided materials that have already been reprinted, or otherwise made easily available. In particular I have not used anything from the selected writings of Boas, Sapir, and Lee; the recently re-issued memorial volume to Sapir (*Language, Culture, Personality*, edited by Spier, Hallowell, Newman); and the *Language in Culture* volume discussing Whorf, edited by Hoijer and distributed as a memoir by the American Anthropological Association. The one exception is Whorf. All his significant writings in the field of language and culture have been collected by Carroll (*Language, Thought, and Reality*), and some of his essays have been reprinted many times, yet Part IV could hardly appear without him. I have chosen an early and little known piece, hitherto published only by Carroll, which sets Whorf's other writings in perspective, both as to the balance of his own views and interests, and as to his place in the tradition of American anthropology.

Except for some articles of historical significance, the contents have been chosen more for subject-matter, than for author, and the absence of a well known name is accidental, as is the recurrence of another. In one case it proved just not possible to obtain from one author an article for which I had hoped for some time. On the other hand, I have tried not to favor any one author unduly, and, other things equal, have chosen an article by someone not otherwise represented. Undoubtedly accidents of personal history have unconsciously influenced the outcome. Of course sometimes a scholar whose name is linked with a topic seems not to have happened to write an appropriate or available piece; sometimes articles have had to be omitted because of practical considerations of size, difficulty of editing, or cost. Such are the trials of an editor

of an anthology, and indeed, some articles had been edited for inclusion before one problem or another forced reluctant omission.

I had at first thought to include nothing of my own, despite several suggestions, but finally decided that the historical account of Kroeber's work was the most useful piece available for pairing with that by Malkiel in the final section, as well as a complement to the Foreword and an appropriate conclusion for the book as a whole.

Just as easily accessible articles have been avoided, so those difficult of access have often been preferred. I have taken special pleasure in finding a pertinent but not well known article, especially if by a leading anthropologist not best known for his work with language. There has been an effort to have a reasonable geographical distribution, although my own specialization in the American field, and hence closer knowledge of its literature, may show. The proportion of articles dealing with the American Indian, however, reflects far more the concentration of American anthropology in that area until recently. A decade from now a revision of this book would be weighted much more toward Africa, Oceania, and Asia. I have tried to represent the anthropology-linked traditions of linguistic work in England and France, the two countries whose linguistics and anthropology are most influentially tied to those of the United States.

Finally, I hope that the inclusion of two reviews will help call attention to the importance of reviews in the development of the field, and the necessity of consulting them. It is especially true in linguistics that a review may be a significant publication in its own right.

As to the placing of articles in sections, the present arrangement has grown by trial-and-error from repeated shufflings. Some articles have ties with more than one topic. The index to topical bibliographies and the reference notes help make it possible to trace such connections, and should be useful to teachers wishing to make reading assignments in terms of a course organization of a different structure, and to students wishing to follow their own noses.

Certain points about the editing of the contents need to be noted. In most of the cases the present selection represents the complete original. There are two kinds of exception. In some cases the present selection represents a continuous portion of a book or longer article, whose other contents would have been less relevant or out of place. Such (in order of appearance in the book) are Boas on linguistics and ethnology; Firth's discussion of sociological linguistics; Strehlow's comments on Aranda traditions; the portion from Boas' monograph on Kwakiutl place names; the section from Goodenough's Truk monograph (revised for this book); the sections from Gayton and Newman's Yokuts monograph; and Kroeber's discussion of taxonomy. In a few cases an intervening part of the original has been omitted. Such cases (all with approval of the author, except in the cases of the deceased Boas and Whorf, of course) are Boas' remarks on grammatical categories; Hill's Cherokee analysis; Whorf's manuscript; Shimkin's account of Wind River Shoshone literature; Sebeok's analysis of Cheremis charms; and Gudschinsky's account

of lexicostatistical technique. In the case of Sebeok's article, another section subsequently written, has been added. All such intervening omissions have been marked.

To present as uniform a volume as possible, avoiding clashes and vagaries of style, and to economize, footnotes to the original articles have frequently been incorporated into the main text, if of substantive relevance, or assembled in the reference note at the end, if bearing on the backgrounds of the material (sponsorship, source of data, orthography used). Citations have also been standardized, and incomplete references have been corrected insofar as practicable. In addition, orthography has been standardized where possible. The orthographic changes, primarily a question of conformity to contemporary American usage, have been explained in a separate Note on Orthography. Scholars must thus consult the original publication, should a question arise as to a point of form in these respects.

It is a pleasant task to be able to thank so many for their help in making the book a reality. To the late Alfred Kroeber, I am indebted in many ways, not least for his Foreword to this book, written at the expense of other commitments. To the late Clyde Kluckhohn, I should like to dedicate the book as a whole. It was conceived and carried near to completion during years at Harvard, when the opportunities given me were owed largely to him. All of us are indebted to him, as to Kroeber, for championing linguistics in anthropology during the last decade.

Actual work on the book began at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences during 1957–1958, and the use of its facilities for the purpose is but one of the reasons I have to remember the Center, and its guiding hands, Ralph Tyler and Preston Cutler, with gratitude. Bob Hogan there, Martha Robinson at Harvard, and Clay Denman and Grace Lee at Berkeley helped provide the material manuscript; Karl Reisman at Harvard, and Joseph McHugh, Bob Scholte, Laura Gould at Berkeley contributed to its editing. I am grateful to the Center; the Laboratory of Social Relations at Harvard and its late director, Sam Stouffer; the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, its director J. O. Brew, and its librarian, Margaret Currier; the Faculty Research Committee of the University of California at Berkeley; and the Social Science Research Council (through an Auxiliary Research Award) for support and aid of my planning, delving, editing, and writing.

I should like to thank all those who have taken the time and trouble to answer inquiries and to give advice, especially the authors for their cooperation and assistance, and generally the authors, editors, and institutions who have generously granted the permission necessary to such a collection. I hope that they will regard the book as having justified their confidence.

Harry Hoijer must be singled out for special thanks; the book was first conceived as a joint undertaking with him. I should like also to mention Martin Joos, who suggested the appropriateness of "linguistic anthropology," rather than "anthropological linguistics," as name for the concerns represented here;